



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,153	12/06/2004	Lasse Wesseltoft Mogensen	12706-9	5568
757	7590	09/07/2006		
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			EXAMINER KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/517,153	Applicant(s) MOGENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher D. Koharski	Art Unit 3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/18/05, 6/12/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges amended claims 1-25 and new claim 26, currently claims 1-26 are pending for examination in this application. Examiner acknowledges the amended specification and abstract. For response to arguments see below regarding the Remarks filed 6/12/2006.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDS) that were submitted on 7/1/2005 and 6/12/2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statements.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-19 and 21-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miles (5,916,199). Miles discloses a tapeless tubing anchoring system with IV applications.

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Miles discloses a device for subcutaneous supply system with a cannula housing (18), cannula, flexible tubing (20), with a first and second end that carries a source coupling on both ends and forms some parallel courses (Figure 1). Holders are present with guides to receive tubing therein, with the first

Art Unit: 3763

holder being capable of being moved when the tubing is pulled distally, the anchor of the first device is capable of being sufficiently loose to allow for movement of the guide down the forearm as disclosed in claims 1 and 12 (Figure 1).

Regarding claims 3-8, 10-11, 14-19 and 21-26, Miles discloses holders that are capable of holding tubing with multiple bores therein, with tubing extending inertiorly within the housing and is capable of comprising a source coupling (Figures 2 and 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miles in view of Reekie (6,105,218). Miles meets the claim limitations as described above except for a first holder with multiple bores.

However, Reekie teaches a snap-type fastening device.

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Reekie teaches a tubing holder device that has multiple bores (Figure 4).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to add more bores as in Reekie to the system of Miles to receive more tubing to facilitate better holding and support of tubing. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Reekie.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miles in further view of White (5,643,216). Miles meets the claim limitations as described above but does not include three parallel courses of tubing:

However, White teaches a patient tubing bracelet. Regarding claims 9 and 20, White teaches the an IV tubing system that has three parallel tubing courses and is capable of creating several more courses through its guide and bore system (Figure 5).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the system of Miles with the guide channels of White because the addition of the additional guide channels provides more precise tubing control and allows for several more tubing configurations for adaptability. Both references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of White.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 6/12/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8, 10-19, and 21-25 under Teissen-Simony (5,522,803) in view of Wilder et al. (4,606,735) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Miles (see above).

Applicant's arguments filed 6/12/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 9 and 20, Wilder et al. is used to supply the teaching of multiple courses not the movement of tubing within the assembly. Although the tubing is held by a interference fit system that is capable of allowing tubing movement there through.

Conclusion



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 8/14/2006


Christopher D. Koharski
AU 3763
MONITORING & CONTROL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2760